

ATTACHMENT - REMARKS

By this Amendment, independent claim 1 (and withdrawn independent claim 10) has been amended to better define the invention and to better differentiate over the cited prior art (and so that both claims include a common inventive feature). Dependent claims 3 and 6 have also been added to overcome the § 112 . It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

Initially in the *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112* section of the outstanding Office Action, dependent claims 3 and 6 were rejected for failing to comply with the written description. In particular, the following issues and corrections have been made.

- 1) Claim 3 was rejected for use of the phrase "nozzle system". By this Amendment, the objected to phrase has been deleted and instead use of the term "unit" is now used consistent with the disclosure at page 4, lines 14-18 and as would be readily appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art.
- 2) Claim 6 was rejected evidently for the use of the terms "gradually" and "dynamic" in the noted clause. While it seems that such terms (and the clause itself) are self-evident, especially from the drawings which the examiner evidently did not consider but as well from the specification as those of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate (and particularly as "dynamic" was originally and still is used in claim 5), the noted terms have been deleted so that the support for the remaining portions of the clause are at least self-evident from the drawings and in particular figure 1 and figure 4.

Therefore, in view of these changes, it is submitted that this rejection of claims 3 and 6 has been overcome and thus should be withdrawn.

In the following rejection under § 112, the pending claims were rejected for being indefinite due to a term used in independent claim 1 and again for the use of “nozzle system” in dependent claim 3 (corrected as noted above). While it is submitted that the term “special” would be well understood by those of ordinary skill in the art to be equivalent to “customized” or the like since each bending ring would be well known by those of ordinary skill to be so designed, for convenience the term “special” has simply been deleted to overcome the rejection. Therefore, as the issues with both claims 1 and 3 have been overcome, it is submitted that this rejection should also be withdrawn.

In the *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103* section, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3, 5-7, 9 and 13 were all rejected as being anticipated or obvious over the principal Hoetzi ‘483 patent in view of the Hoetzi ‘329 patent (incorporated by reference in Hoetzi ‘483 patent). However, for the following reasons, it is submitted that these claims are all allowable over the Hoetzi ‘483 patent either singly or in view of the teachings of the Hoetzi ‘329 patent.

It is initially noted that the examiner has acknowledged that the only teachings in the Hoetzi ‘483 patent concerning an upper pressure pad is to be taken from Hoetzi ‘329 patent. The Hoetzi ‘329 patent discloses a top pressure pad for a continuously moving metal strip. Therefore, while it might be obvious to use a top pressure pad in the system of the Hoetzi ‘483 patent, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Hoetzi ‘329 patent of using or also using the top pressure pad as an elevation stop for the sides of the glass sheet as now particularly claimed in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that amended independent claim 1 (and likewise withdrawn independent apparatus claim 10) is allowable over the Hoetzi ‘483 patent even in view

of the teachings of the Hoetzi '329 patent. For these same reasons, it is also submitted that dependent claims 3, 5-7, 9 and 13 depending from independent claim 1 (and withdrawn dependent claims 11-12 depending from independent claim 10) are likewise allowable.

Further and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2009

/Douglas E. Jackson/

Signed By Name: Douglas E. Jackson
Attorney of Record Registration No.: 28,518

STITES & HARBISON PLLC ♦ 1199 North Fairfax St. ♦ Suite 900 ♦ Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: 703-739-4900 ♦ FAX: 703-739-9577 ♦ CUSTOMER NO. 881